

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of 06/01/2005 has been reviewed. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 6 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fons et al [U.S. Patent No. 5617585] in view of Hunt et al [Pub No. U.S. 2003/0213184 A1]." No objection is made with regard to the Examiner's review of what the various prior art references teach. Objection is, however, made with regard to what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art upon a review of the prior art references.

It is agreed that similarities exist between applicant's invention as presently claimed and the prior art sock of Fons et al and search booths of Hunt. A fair reading of these references alone or together reveals no teaching or suggestion of utilizing the Fons et al type sock at the search booth of Hunt nor to use the search booth of Hunt in association with the sock of Fons et al. As such, there is no teaching for the combination of these references in an effort to anticipate applicant's invention as claimed. Beyond the impropriety of combining the Examiner's references, there is still the problem that the prior art fails to disclose the specifically claimed "entrance station also having a plurality of containers" and wherein "each container containing pairs of socks of a


common size". Note the last three lines of Paragraph 2 of Claim 1. Further, the first three lines of Paragraph 5 of Claim 1 fully recite "an exit station including a trash basket for each passenger's pair of socks after each passenger has passed through the metal detection station". There is nothing in the Examiner's prior art disclosing such a plurality of containers nor the trash basket for the socks in combination with search booths as disclosed and claimed. Claim 2 has been amended by the addition of a "trash basket for the pairs of socks after being screened" in a manner to the language of Claim 1. In addition to this, the trash basket is claimed in combination with the "plurality of containers with each container containing pairs of socks of a common size to be selected by a passenger to be screened" in a manner to the language of Claim 1. Claims 3 - 6 depend from Claim 2 and as such all of the claims of the instant application have such structure and functions not found anywhere in the prior art taken alone or in combination.

It would appear that the Examiner has merely gleaned miscellaneous features in the prior art and has attempted to combine them without a teaching for their combination. The only teaching is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art. But even if there were a

teaching for the combination, the resulting structure would still fail to anticipate applicant's invention for the reasons set forth herein above.

It is deemed that the amendments herein overcome all grounds of objection and rejection. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



FRANCINE L. HEWES
Reg. 50,138
Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick, LLP
101 E. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 2800
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 229-7600